

REMARKS

Claims 1-5 and 8-14 are pending in this application and the action was made final by the Examiner.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejects claims 1-5 and 8-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murray (U.S. Patent No. 6,392,668 B1) in view of Sall (U.S. Patent No. 6,859,219 B1). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 1 recites a portable information terminal device comprising, in part, “a display control means for displaying the information on selected ones of said plural, physically separate display means.”

The Examiner rejects claim 1, in part, because the Examiner alleges Murray discloses two physically separate display means. Murray discloses a client-side system and method for network link differentiation. Murray discloses a single “display or monitor,” not the multiple display means of the present invention.

However, the Examiner has failed to address this issue. The Examiner in the office action dated August 21, 2006 on Page 3 states that the claims were only amended to show “separate display means” which still does not “clearly define that there are two separate physical monitors/displays.” However, the Applicant further amended the claims to recite two separate physical monitors. The Examiner appears to have ignored this additional limitation recited in claim 1.

The Applicant maintains our previous arguments in response to the Examiner’s final

office action. Specifically, the combined teachings of Murray and Sall do not suggest separate physical display means as required by the present invention. A skilled artisan would not have found it obvious to make the portable information terminal device based on the suggestion of Murray and Sall at least because of the above reasons.

Claim 2 contains analogous limitations as claim 1 and should therefore be patentable for analogous reasons.

Claim 3, as recited in the appendix, contains analogous limitations as claim 1 and should therefore be patentable for analogous reasons. Claim 8 should be patentable for at least the same reasons because of its dependency on claim 3.

Claim 4 contains analogous limitations as claim 1 and should therefore be patentable for analogous reasons. Claim 9 should be patentable for at least the same reasons because of its dependency on claim 4.

Claim 5 contains analogous limitations as claim 1 and should therefore be patentable for analogous reasons. Claim 10 should be patentable for at least the same reasons because of its dependency on claim 5.

Claim 11 contains analogous limitations as claim 1 and should therefore be patentable for analogous reasons.

Claim 12, as recited in the appendix, contains analogous limitations as claim 1 and should therefore be patentable for analogous reasons.


Claim 13 contains analogous limitations as claim 1 and should therefore be patentable for analogous reasons.

Claim 14 contains analogous limitations as claim 1 and should therefore be patentable for analogous reasons.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

Handwritten signature of Howard L. Bernstein, with the number 43,355 written below it.

Howard L. Bernstein
Registration No. 25,665

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: December 20, 2006